

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 24, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-40. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 17 and 36, cancelled claims 2-5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 21-24, 26-28, 30-34, 37 and 38, and added new claims 41-47. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Request for Acknowledgment of Consideration of Submitted References

As a preliminary matter, Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed April 16, 2007 have been considered. The Examiner has not yet acknowledged reference "AH" of the above-referenced Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant requests consideration and entry of the cited references.

Examiner Interview

On October 23, 2007, Applicant's representative, Brian D. Kaul, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Vijay Chawan, to discuss the above-identified application and the rejection of claim 1 based on Baker et al. During the interview, Applicant explained the purpose of the present invention as a method for entering text into a device and distinguished the method from prior art methods, such as those described in the background of the present application.

Applicant further pointed out that while Baker et al. may disclose a method of entering data based on a vocalization of a user [Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and Lines 44-64], the method in Baker et al. fails to disclose the specific combination of steps provided in claim 1. As explained during the interview, claim 1 includes "providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry word" and "capturing a vocalization of the text entry word". The particular order of these two steps is interchangeable. Applicant agreed with the Examiner's finding that Baker et al. discloses the capture of a vocalization, which is analyzed to identify an address corresponding to the vocalization. However, Baker et al. do not disclose the "first character input . . . indicative of a first character of" the vocalized text entry word. Additionally, Applicant explained that Baker et al. do not disclose the identification of a probable word

candidate that is based upon 1) the first character input and 2) an analysis of the vocalization, as provided in claim 1.

The Examiner indicated that she had misinterpreted claim 1 as merely being directed to a method in which a user presses a key and vocalizes the key in order to train a speech recognition system. Applicant explained that the embodiments of the invention are specifically addressed to “a method of entering text into a device”, as is explained throughout the application. The entering of text in accordance with embodiments of the invention is distinct from speech recognition training methods, which are used to train the speech recognition system for later use in entering text.

The Examiner indicated that the rejections based on Baker et al. would be withdrawn and that a new search would likely be conducted. The Examiner requested that Applicant provide a written response to the Office Action explaining the above.

Applicant submitted that claim amendments would likely be made in an effort to reduce the number of claims to no more than five independent claims and twenty-five total claims. Additionally, Applicant indicated that a new independent claim would be added that is specifically directed to a method of entering text in a mobile computing device.

Applicant requested that the Examiner not make the next Office Action final in light of the fact that a new search would be required due to the deficiencies of Baker et al. as opposed to any amendments made by Applicant. The Examiner indicated that the next Office Action would not likely be made final.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended the claims to reduce the total in number of claims to twenty-five. Further, claims 17 and 36 have been amended and new claims 41-47 have been added. Applicant respectfully believes that a new search is not necessitated by the claim amendments. Rather, even if Applicant refrained from making any amendments in this response, the Examiner would be required to perform a new search due to the deficiencies of Baker et al. described below. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the next office action not be made final.

No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,172). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference for the reasons set forth below.

Baker et al. provide a voice-enabled directory look-up system, in which an operator's vocalization of a portion of an address or a name of an addressee is captured and analyzed to present records that best match the vocalized address or addressee. This is explained in the cited sections of Baker et al. (Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64), which were identified as disclosing all of the claimed elements of independent claims 1 and 20. However, as mentioned above, Baker et al. fail to disclose or suggest the combination of elements provided in independent claims 1 and 20.

With regard to claim 1, Baker et al. do not disclose or suggest "providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry word; . . . capturing a vocalization of the text entry word; [and] . . . identifying a probable word candidate for the vocalization based upon the first character input and an analysis of the vocalization", as provided in claim 1. For instance, Baker et al. do not disclose the entry of the claimed first character input in addition to the capture of a vocalization, both of which correspond to a text entry word. Moreover, Baker et al. fail to disclose the identification of a probable word candidate as based upon 1) the first character input and 2) an analysis of the captured vocalization, as provided in claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Baker et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, Applicant requests that the rejections of claims 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 41, which depend from independent claim 1, be withdrawn at least based on their dependency from independent claim 1.

As with claim 1, Baker et al. do not disclose or suggest the similar steps recited in independent claim 20. For instance, Baker et al. fail to disclose "providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry; . . . capturing a vocalization of the text entry; [and] . . . identifying a probable word candidate for a first word of the vocalization based upon the first character input and an analysis of the vocalization", as provided in claim 20. Therefore,

independent claim 20 is not anticipated by Baker et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, claims 25, 29, 35, 36 and 42, which depend from independent claim 20, are allowable in view of Baker et al. at least based on their dependency from independent claim 20. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Additional arguments for withdrawing the rejections of some of the claims depending from independent claims 1 and 20 are provided below.

Claims 6 and 25 both recite “wherein the providing step a) includes pressing a key corresponding to multiple characters”. In rejecting claims 6 and 25, the Examiner cited Col. 6, Lines 24-34 of Baker et al. as reading on the claim limitation. The cited section of Baker et al. provides an example of how the invention could be applied to other directory look-up contexts. The cited section reads as follows:

For example, accuracy and recognition in an automated telephone directory assistance system might be improved by implementing the present invention therein. In such a system, the user might select a state, then a city, then a listing. At one or more of the selection steps, the user speaks the first few characters of the data item, and the system presents a list of candidate entries. The user selects the desired entry (in response to the list presented by the system) by pressing a key on the telephone keypad.

Accordingly, the cited section of Baker et al. describes the use of the telephone keypad to select a desired entry from a list of candidate entries that are generated in response to a vocalization of the desired entry by the user.

As a result, the candidate entry selection process disclosed in the cited section of Baker et al. is unrelated to a method of providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry word, which used to identify a probable word candidate. Therefore, claims 6 and 25 are not anticipated by Baker et al.

With regard to claims 10 and 29, the Examiner found Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64 to disclose all of the claimed elements. However, the cited sections fail to disclose “identifying the probable word candidate from the list of probable word candidates . . . based upon the first

character input”, as provided in claims 10 and 29. Therefore, claims 10 and 29 are not anticipated by Baker et al.

With regard to claim 12, the cited section of Baker et al. (Abstract, Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64) does not disclose “narrowing a list of vocalized word candidates using the first character input to form a narrowed list of vocalized word candidates”, as provided in claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

In rejecting claim 14, the Examiner cited Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64 as disclosing all of the elements of claim 14. However, the cited section of Baker et al. does not disclose “narrowing a list of input word candidates using the first character input to form a narrowed list of input word candidates for the vocalization”, as provided in claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 is not anticipated by Baker et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 based on the disclosure of Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64 of Baker et al. However, the cited sections of Baker et al. do not disclose “providing a second character input that is indicative of a second character of the text entry word, wherein the probable word candidate identified in step c) is based on the first and second character inputs and the analysis of the vocalization”, as provided in claim 16. Therefore, claim 16 is not anticipated by Baker et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 37 based on the disclosure provided at Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-46 of Baker et al. As stated above, the cited sections of Baker et al. do not disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 20, including “providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry word” (claim 1) or “providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry” (claim 20). Additionally, the cited sections do not disclose “providing a second character input that is indicative of a first character of a second text entry word” or “identifying a probable word candidate for the vocalization of the second text entry word based upon the second character input and an analysis of the vocalization of the second text entry word”, as provided in claim 18. Likewise, the cited sections of Baker et al. do not disclose “providing a second character input that is indicative of a first character of a second text entry” or “identifying a probable word candidate for the vocalization of the second text entry based upon the second character input and an analysis of the vocalization of the second

text entry”, as provided in claim 37. Therefore, claims 18 and 37 are not anticipated by Baker et al.

The Examiner also rejected claim 39 based on the disclosure in Col. 2, Lines 10-24 and 44-64 of Baker et al. However, the cited sections do not disclose “providing a second character input that is indicative of a first character of a second word of the vocalization” or “identifying a probable word candidate for the second word of the vocalization based upon the second character input and an analysis of the vocalization”, as provided in claim 39. Therefore, claim 39 is not anticipated by Baker et al.

New Claims

With this Amendment, Applicant has added independent claim 43, which is directed to a method of entering text into a mobile computing device by a user of the mobile computing device. The method of claim 43 generally includes more specific embodiments of the steps described in independent claims 1 and 20. For instance, claim 43 includes “providing a first character input that is indicative of a first character of a text entry word comprising pressing a key of a key pad of the mobile computing device corresponding to the first character; vocalizing the text entry word into a microphone of the mobile computing device; capturing the vocalization of the text entry word; [and] identifying a probable word candidate for the captured vocalization of the text entry word based upon the first character input and an analysis of the captured vocalization of the text entry word”. As discussed above, Baker et al. do not disclose the combination of these steps. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 43 and claims 44-47, which depend from claim 43, are allowable in view of Baker et al.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully believes that the application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendments and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/elk